



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,808	02/21/2006	Gunnar Nordstrom	1505-1081	5679
466	7590	09/30/2009		
YOUNG & THOMPSON			EXAMINER	
209 Madison Street			LOWE, MICHAEL S	
Suite 500				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3652	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/30/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/538,808	Applicant(s) NORDSTROM, GUNNAR
	Examiner Michael Scott Lowe	Art Unit 3652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11,12 and 17-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 11,12 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2008 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/8/09
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/9/09 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11,12, 17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rebucci (US 4,150,701) in view of Christensen (US 2,433,738).

Re claim 11, Rebucci teaches an output device for a container (generally 60,90) which comprises a bottom (generally 40) and a surrounding wall, comprising a hub (generally 80) and at least two arms (generally 82,84) fixed to the hub (generally 80), characterized in that each arm is designed with

- at least one outer section designed and arranged to at use being capable of essentially preventing material from being brought towards the wall of the container, and
- at least one inner section connected to the outer section, designed and arranged to at

Art Unit: 3652

use being capable of bringing the material essentially in the direction of feed for the device, at which the at least two arms present essentially concave surfaces facing the direction of feed; the arms (generally 82,84) extend essentially to the wall of the container (generally 60,90); the container bottom having at least one principally gap-shaped discharge opening (generally 42) located between the hub and the outer ends of the arms; and a frame (such as generally 90,40, and unnumbered items seen in figure 1) is arranged adjacent to the outer ends of the arms, the frame being fixed to the container. Rebucci does not teach the discharge opening extending from the inner wall of the container radially to the hub. However, Christensen teaches having discharge openings (generally 24,25,59,etc.) extending from the inner wall of the container radially to the hub in order regulate and direct the discharge (column 5, line 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have tried modifying Rebucci by Christensen to have discharge openings extending from the inner wall of the container radially to the hub in order to achieve the predictable result of regulating and directing the discharge;

Rebucci teaches the arms designed with a wedge-shaped cross section, where the wedge-shape tapers (see figure 3) contrary to the direction of feed.

Re claim 12, Rebucci teaches each arm (generally 82,84) is continuously bent (stays bent and is bent along length).

Re claims 17, Rebucci teaches a driving device capable of driving the arms with a rotating movement.

Claims 18,19, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rebucci (US 4,150,701) in view of Christensen (US 2,433,738) and Cantenot (US 4,099,633).

Re claims 18,19, Rebucci does not teach a driving device capable of driving the device with a reciprocating movement. Cantenot teaches a driving device capable of driving the device with a reciprocating movement in order to sweep effectively (column 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have tried modifying Rebucci by the general teaching of Cantenot to have a driving device capable of driving the device with a reciprocating movement in order to achieve the predictable result of sweeping effectively.

Conclusion

Applicant's arguments filed 7/9/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Rebuci's arms do not taper in the direction contrary to the direction of feed, the direction of feed being the direction material is brought towards the discharge opening. However Rebuci does taper as claimed the wedge shape of the arms (see figure 3) in the direction contrary to the direction of feed, the direction of feed being the direction material is brought towards the discharge opening (42,43).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Scott Lowe whose telephone number is (571)272-6929. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-4:30pm M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saul Rodriguez can be reached on (571)272-7097. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Scott Lowe/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3652